



Illinois State Board of Education

May 2016

Guidance Document
#16-2

Guidance on Assistant Principal
Performance Evaluation in Illinois

This document is intended to provide non-regulatory guidance on the subject matter listed above. For specific questions, please contact the person(s) identified in the document.

Dr. Tony Smith, State Superintendent



Guidance on *Assistant Principal Performance Evaluation* in Illinois

Assistant principals are important to the continued improvement of Illinois public schools, and, like all educational professionals, assistant principals need support to advance their practice and careers. The Performance Evaluation Reform Act (PERA; P.A. 96-861) requires the Illinois State Board of Education to develop and implement principal and assistant principal performance evaluations to document performance quality and effectiveness that informs professional growth planning. PERA specifies that principals and assistant principals will be evaluated annually and that the performance evaluation will include assistant principal and principal practice measures as well as school-level student growth.

The Illinois State Model for Principal Evaluation, which is applicable to assistant principals, satisfies the Illinois State Board of Education’s statutory requirements for performance evaluation and describes standards and measures that districts can use to evaluate these school-level administrators (Illinois State Board of Education, n.d.). The State Model for Principal Evaluation communicates the standards and processes for evaluating principals *and* assistant principals, and the state model has been aligned with the Inter-state School Leadership Licensure Consortium standards (The Council for Chief State School Officers, 2008). School districts are not required to use the State Model for Principal Evaluation, but school districts are required to comply with all requirements of the School Code and relevant Administrative Rules (see Box 1). Important to note, the State Model for Principal Evaluation provides school districts with an approach to principal and assistant principal evaluation that supports professional development planning with accountability to grow leadership talent. To make better use of this guidance document, we recommend reading the State Model for Principal Evaluation guidance prior to using this guidance.

This document was developed in response to district requests for further guidance on assistant principal evaluation. In many cases, assistant principal job responsibilities differ from those responsibilities of principals and vary within and between schools within a district. Given this variability, districts may seek to differentiate assistant principal evaluation in ways that ensure assistant principals receive performance ratings and feedback that more closely reflect their actual roles and responsibilities. This guidance was written specifically for educators fulfilling job responsibilities under the title *assistant principal* or *vice principal*, per PERA job title definitions. It specifically addresses potential adaptations to the Illinois State Model for Principal Evaluation that districts may choose to employ for evaluating assistant principals. Districts using models other than the state model also may find this guidance useful for designing or adapting approaches to the evaluation of assistant principals as well as other district and school administrators.

To this end, the guidance document provides a brief overview of PERA, provides an overview of research on the nature and variation in assistant principal work practices, and offers an approach districts may consider when adapting the state model for use in evaluating assistant principals.

Background: Requirements for Assistant Principal Performance Evaluation

According to Statute 105 ILCS5/24A-15 and Illinois Administrative Code Part 50, Section 50.300 (see Box 1), all school districts must annually evaluate assistant principal performance. A school district may choose to adopt the State Model for Principal Evaluation, create a performance evaluation plan, or adapt the State Model for Principal Evaluation for the purposes of assistant principal evaluation.

Box 1. Statute and Administrative Rule Pertaining to Assistant Principal Evaluation

Statute 105 ILCS5/24A-15

- The evaluation shall include a description of the principal’s or assistant principal’s duties and responsibilities and the standards to which the principal or assistant principal is expected to conform.
- The evaluation for a principal must be performed by the district superintendent, the superintendent’s designee, or, in the absence of the superintendent or his designee, an individual appointed by the school board who holds a registered Type 75 State administrative certificate. The evaluation for an assistant principal must be performed by the principal, the district superintendent, the superintendent’s designee, or, in the absence of the superintendent or his or her designee, an individual appointed by the school board who holds a registered Type 75 State administrative certificate.
- One copy of the evaluation must be included in the principal’s or assistant principal’s personnel file and one copy of the evaluation must be provided to the principal or assistant principal.
- Failure by a district to evaluate a principal or assistant principal and to provide the principal or assistant principal with a copy of the evaluation is evidence that the principal or assistant principal is performing duties and responsibilities in at least a satisfactory manner and shall serve to automatically extend the principal’s or assistant principal’s contract for a period of one year after the contract would otherwise expire, under the same terms and conditions as the prior year’s contract.
- Prior to September 1, 2012, school districts must: Consider the principal’s or assistant principal’s specific duties, responsibilities, management, and competence as a principal or assistant principal;
 - Consider the principal’s or assistant principal’s strengths and weaknesses with supporting reasons; and,
 - Align evaluations for principals and assistant principals with the Illinois Professional Standards for School Leaders or research-based district standards.
- On and after September 1, 2012, school districts must (in addition to the requirements above):
 - Rate principals and assistant principals as “Excellent”, “Proficient”, “Needs Improvement” or “Unsatisfactory”;
 - Evaluate principals or assistant principals once every school year by March 1 (or July 1 for Chicago Public Schools); and,
 - Provide for the use of data and indicators on student growth as a significant factor in rating performance.

The State Model for Principal Evaluation, which also may be applied to assistant principal evaluation, includes two major components:

1. Evaluation of principal practice, which assesses the quality of principals' or assistant principals' work using observation and other measures against a rubric that articulates performance levels
2. Evaluation of principal performance based on student growth, using measures of student performance against predetermined growth goals that are appropriate to the principal or assistant principal organizational level (e.g., elementary school)

Summative principal and assistant principal ratings are determined by combining the principal practice and the student growth scores to determine the administrator's level of performance on a 4-point scale with designations for excellent, proficient, needs improvement, and unsatisfactory. Supervisors and principals and assistant principals use performance ratings when creating professional development plans (or professional growth plans), and supervisors consider ratings when making human resources decisions.

Background: Research and Considerations on the Assistant Principal Work Responsibilities

PERA offers school districts latitude in developing assistant principal evaluation systems that meet local needs and contexts. This section of the document synthesizes background research on assistant principal work responsibilities to assist districts in making informed decisions about assistant principal evaluation design that can best reflect the varying roles and responsibilities of assistant principals.

Assistant principals are critical to schools' leadership, and districts' school leadership pipeline (Turnbull, Riley, & MacFarlane, 2013). While assistant principals play critical roles, their responsibilities vary between districts and schools and can vary within schools as well (Barnett, Shoho, & Oleszewski, 2012; Greenfield, 1984; Hausman, Nebeker, McGreary, & Donaldson, 2002; Mertz, 2000). Assistant principals may be assigned responsibilities that complement school principal or school leadership team strengths and address school improvement priorities. For many individuals, the assistant principal role fulfills a career ambition, and other individuals view the assistant principal position as an apprenticeship for

Box 2. Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium Standards

The Illinois State Model Principal Evaluation expectations are aligned with the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) standards (2008). The Illinois State Model Principal Evaluation standards are:

1. Living a mission and vision focused on results
2. Leading and managing systems change
3. Improving teaching and learning
4. Building and maintaining collaborative relationships
5. Leading with integrity and professionalism
6. Creating and sustaining a culture of high expectations

(Illinois State Board of Education, n.d.)

The national ISLLC standards are intended for use with principals, assistant principals, and other educational leaders (The Council of Chief State School Officers, 2008).

a principal position (Barnett et al., 2012).

Schools in Illinois use a range of configurations of leadership roles, depending on context. For example, assistant principals may lead major aspects of schoolwide initiatives, may act semi-autonomously with grade-level or teacher teams within schools, or may, upon occasion, lead the entire school during periods when principals are out of the building or when principal turnover occurs (Turnbull et al., 2013). Based upon a research review, assistant principals may be responsible for attendance, curriculum, operations, teacher evaluation, student activities, and other aspects of school life to differing degrees. Some assistant principal responsibilities may address all of these task areas, and other responsibilities address some of the areas. Similarly, some assistant principal responsibilities may affect all students in a school, and other responsibilities influence subsets of the student population.

Although assistant principal job responsibilities vary, the Illinois State Model for Principal Evaluation communicates the same performance standards for principals and assistant principals. The approach is similar to that of the Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (National Policy Board for Education Administration, 2015) and the ISLLC standards (Council of Chief State School Officers, 2008) (see Box 2), which establishes expectations for principals *and* assistant principals without differentiating the two positions.

A common set of standards for principals and assistant principals establishes a language for discussing school leadership and advancing knowledge about leading schools but does not always reflect differences in leadership responsibilities between the principal and assistant principal positions. Differentiation of personnel evaluations is important for supporting professional growth and accountability. The Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation (2008) standards concluded that the most impactful personnel evaluations are closely aligned with educators' responsibilities and help ensure that educators are held accountable for the work that they perform and receive feedback on key performance areas relevant to their work.

Although the Illinois Administrative Code Part 50 does not differentiate between the evaluation of principals and assistant principals, it does offer school districts latitude in creating, adopting, or adapting evaluation approaches. Therefore, school districts may adapt the Illinois State Model Principal Evaluation system or other principal evaluation system to better reflect assistant principals' job responsibilities and remain in compliance with Illinois Administrative Code Part 50. The following section describes an approach school districts, when adapting the state model to evaluate assistant principals, can take that aligns with PERA, allows assistant principals to be evaluated against state standards, and also enables school districts to differentiate evaluations according to variations in assistant principal work responsibilities.

Devising Evaluation Systems Suitable for Assistant Principals

If a district decides to use or adapt the Illinois State Model for Principal Evaluation, this guidance explains two options and provides Illinois examples of those options. Districts may explore other options as well. For instance, a district may opt to create or use a new, separate assistant principal evaluation system that includes different practice rubrics, measures, and growth formulas. Should a district choose this latter option, we recommend consulting with legal counsel. Districts choosing to adapt the Illinois State Model for Principal Evaluation to the

assistant principal position are encouraged to address the following questions as they consider modifications to the state model.

We recommend that each district should have an assistant principal evaluation that applies to all assistant principals and that has written procedures. First, a district must determine whether all assistant principals in the school district will be evaluated with the same practice and student growth measures or whether the district will provide assistant principal evaluators discretion in selecting different measures for assistant principals. The degree to which assistant principals' work responsibilities are similar or different may influence a district's decision. In districts where assistant principal work responsibilities are very similar, the district may find it useful to use the same measures for all assistant principals. In districts where assistant principal work responsibilities vary greatly, the district may allow assistant principal evaluators some discretion to choose appropriate practice or growth measures that show alignment with work responsibilities.

We also recommend that school districts decide which specific practice measures and student growth measures will be used. Table 1 summarizes recommended approaches for practice and student growth adaptations to the State Model Principal Evaluation system for use with assistant principal positions.

1. Select one of two preferred approaches to determining the assistant principal practice evaluation (Table 1, leftmost column): (a) no differentiation or (b) weighted differentiation.
2. Select one of two preferred approaches to student growth. Within both options, districts may choose to add other measures of student growth that are appropriate to the assistant principal position. Specifically, districts have the option of a student growth component rating approach that pertains to assistant principal work responsibilities by:
 - a. Choose whether Type I and Type II student academic growth component rating approach(es) will be used (Table 1, center column) and whether the assistant principal evaluation will use the same approach as the approach used for principals (i.e., "undifferentiated" approach, Option 1) or whether the assistant principal evaluation will be different than the evaluation used for principals (i.e., "differentiated" approach, Option 2)
 - b. Choose whether other student growth component approaches will be used instead of Type I and Type II or whether other student growth measures will contribute additional information to the assistant principal evaluation (Table 1, rightmost column); also choose whether the assistant principal evaluation will use the same other student growth components as those components used for principals or whether the assistant principal evaluation will use different other student growth components than those components used for principals.

Table 1. Options for Assistant Principal Evaluation

Assistant principal practice evaluation component	Assistant principal student growth evaluation component	
	Student academic growth*	Other student growth**
<p>Option 1: Undifferentiated practice evaluation The same evaluation rubric is used for principal and assistant principal evaluation. Assistant principal practice ratings result from evidence collected on all standards.</p>	<p>Option 1: No Type I or Type II student academic growth categories are included in the assistant principal evaluation. If no Type I or Type II student academic growth categories are determined by districts to apply to assistant principals, then other student growth categories must be identified.</p>	<p>Option 1: No additional student growth categories are included in the assistant principal evaluation.</p>
<p>Option 2: Weighted and differentiated practice evaluation The same evaluation rubric is used for principal and assistant principal evaluation. However, assistant principal practice ratings are based upon “weights” or “multipliers” assigned to each standard through agreement by the assistant principal and his or her supervisors prior to the beginning of the evaluation cycle.</p>	<p>Option 2: Undifferentiated student academic growth evaluation Student academic growth evaluation for assistant principals uses the same student growth measures and formulas as those used to evaluate the principal and all other assistant principals assigned to that school.</p>	<p>Option 2: Undifferentiated other student growth component The other student growth category will be the same as the approach used for the principal evaluation.</p>
	<p>Option 3: Differentiated student growth evaluation Student academic growth evaluation for assistant principals is differentiated to reflect the assistant principal job responsibilities for oversight of specific student subgroups and other responsibilities.</p>	<p>Option 3: Differentiated other student growth component The other student growth component for assistant principals reflects their individual job responsibilities and is likely to differ from the principal component and may differ from that of other assistant principals.</p>

The following sections describe options for assistant principal practice evaluation, the student growth evaluation, and summative scoring approaches. The sections include examples from Illinois school district practices to illustrate these approaches.

Options for Assistant Principal Practice Evaluation

This section of the guidance reviews options for evaluating assistant principal practice. In consultation with district leadership, school districts may wish to explore options additional to the options presented in the guidance. Regardless of the option chosen, assistant principal evaluators—typically principals—should be trained and supported to conduct assistant principal evaluations accurately and fairly.

Option 1: Undifferentiated Approach

The undifferentiated option is included in the State Model for Principal Evaluation guidance and is a common approach to assistant principal evaluation used by other states. In this option, principals and assistant principals are evaluated according to same set of standards, practice rubric, and measures. The undifferentiated option is particularly useful for school districts seeking to “build a bench” of future principals through job-embedded professional development and where all assistant principals act semi-autonomously to oversee all aspects of grade levels, schools within schools, or a subdivision of a school.

School districts choosing the undifferentiated option that elect to use the State Model for Principal Evaluation will use the tools and follow the procedures in the state model for determining a practice score. The state model’s evaluation of assistant principal practice will, therefore, use the Illinois Standards for Principal Evaluation and the accompanying rubric of the standards. The principal assigned to oversee an assistant principal’s work and successfully completes the State Model for Principal Evaluation training typically completes the assistant principal evaluation by collecting and evaluating evidence, which may include observations of assistant principals or a portfolio.

According to the state model (Illinois State Board of Education, n.d. p. 4), after collecting evidence, the principal will determine the assistant principal practice score by applying the following decision rules, which are the same as those applied in principal evaluation.

- If an assistant principal provides evidence of performance for at least 75 percent of the descriptors at a specific level of performance (e.g., Proficient), the assistant principal should be rated at that level of performance (i.e., Proficient) for that standard.
- If an assistant principal demonstrates performance for a standard that is split between two levels (excluding Excellent), the assistant principal’s evaluator will use his or her discretion to determine the level most appropriate for that standard.
- To receive an Excellent rating on a standard, an assistant principal must demonstrate at least 75 percent of the Excellent descriptors for the standard (and any descriptors not Excellent must be Proficient).

For the summative performance rating, the assistant principal’s evaluator identifies a performance rating and provides written evidence to support the assigned rating for each standard. The assistant principal practice rating is one of the following:

- **Excellent:** At least four standards are rated as Excellent, including Improving Teaching and Learning, and no “Basic” ratings are assigned.
- **Proficient:** At least four standards are rated as Proficient, including Improving Teaching and Learning.
- **Needs Improvement:** At least three standards are rated as Needs Improvement, including Improving Teaching and Learning.
- **Unsatisfactory:** Any standard is rated as Unsatisfactory.

Option 2: Weighted Differentiated Option

The weighted differentiated option for evaluating assistant principal practice is not explicitly outlined in the State Model for Principal Evaluation guidance¹ but is an option available to school districts. With this option, principals and assistant principals predetermine which standards will be evaluated by agreeing to assign a “weight” or “multiplier” to each standard prior to the start of the evaluation cycle, during a preconference or beginning-of-the-year meeting. The weighted differentiated option is useful for school districts where assistant principal assignments vary between or within schools and for instances where assistant principals do not commonly oversee subdivisions within the school (e.g., schools-within-schools).

A simple approach to weighting is summarized here. Weights are determined by reviewing the assistant principal’s job responsibilities for the academic year against the State Model for Principal Evaluation standards and rubric (or other principal evaluation framework that the district has chosen for the principal and assistant principal evaluation). The assistant principal and his or her supervisor² should consider the following question: Which, if any, standards are not applicable to the assistant principal’s responsibilities this year?

Box 3. Fictional District Example of Weighted Differentiated Approach to Performance Evaluation

One potential approach to assistant principal and principal evaluation allows for weighting and differentiation according to job responsibilities. For example, each school year, administrators might work with assistant principals to determine key focus areas related to their specific roles and responsibilities. These focus areas might be weighted heavier when determining the professional practice performance rating for that assistant principal.

- Focus Area 1 = 30% of Professional Practice Rating
- Focus Area 2 = 30% of Professional Practice Rating
- Focus Area 3 = 30% of Professional Practice Rating
- Remaining Standards = 10% of Professional Practice Rating

After discussing and agreeing to weights for each standard, the assistant principal’s supervisor and assistant principal can complete the following priorities chart or similar chart (see Table 2). In this simple weighting approach:

- A “0” is inserted in the multiplier column if a standard is not being addressed by the assistant principal job assignment,³ and the standard is not evaluated.

¹ We note that the State Model for Principal Evaluation does not use numerical scoring, which involves assigning numbers to performance levels and deriving a summative rating by combining practice scores for each standard.

² Principals often supervise and evaluate assistant principals’ work, but not always. Illinois school districts may configure assistant principal supervision as priorities and needs dictate. To make the guidance inclusive of supervisory situations, we use the term *supervisor* or *assistant principal supervisor* to mean anyone assigned to evaluate assistant principal performance.

³ We use the term *job assignment* to mean the tasks to which an assistant principal is assigned or completes during an academic year. Job assignments are often more closely aligned with the work that assistant principals actually do than job descriptions, which may be more general and not accurately reflect responsibilities.

- A “1” is inserted in the multiplier column if a standard is included in the assistant principal job assignment or if all standards are considered equal in the job assignments. School districts opting to use this numerical scoring approach also can consider additional weighting options. For instance, a standard considered to be a high priority for assistant principal work could be assigned a number higher than “1.”

After the weighting approach is determined, the assistant principal and his or her supervisor sign a formal agreement to the weights. Should assistant principal job assignments change during the year, the weighting formula can be changed by mutual agreement.

Table 2. Sample Matrix for Documenting Weights

Standard		Weight
Living a mission and vision focused on results	X	
Leading and managing systems change	X	
Improving teaching and learning	X	
Building and maintaining collaborative relationships	X	
Leading with integrity and professionalism	X	
Creating and sustaining a culture of high expectations	X	

After collecting evidence of performance, the supervisor can determine the assistant principal practice score by applying the following decision rules, which are the same as those applied in principal evaluation:

- If an assistant principal provides evidence of performance for at least 75 percent of the descriptors at a specific level of performance (e.g., Proficient), the assistant principal should be rated at that level of performance (i.e., Proficient) for that standard.
- If an assistant principal demonstrates performance for a standard that is split between two levels (excluding Excellent), the assistant principal’s supervisor will use his or her discretion to determine the level most appropriate for that standard.
- To receive an Excellent rating on a standard, an assistant principal must demonstrate at least 75 percent of the Excellent descriptors for the standard (and any descriptors not Excellent must be Proficient).

For the summative rating, the assistant principal’s supervisor identifies a performance rating and provides written evidence to support the assigned rating for each standard. The assistant principal practice rating is one of the following:

- **Excellent:** At least a majority of the rated standards are considered Excellent, including Improving Teaching and Learning, and no Basic ratings are assigned.
- **Proficient:** At least a majority of the rated standards are considered Proficient, including Improving Teaching and Learning.
- **Needs Improvement:** At least one of the rated standards is considered Needs Improvement, including Improving Teaching and Learning.
- **Unsatisfactory:** Any standard is rated as Unsatisfactory.

Box 4. Fictional Example of Weighted Differentiated Option for Evaluating Practice

Melissa Robinson is a fifth-year assistant principal at Lawrence High School, a comprehensive high school in mid-state Illinois. She became an assistant principal after eight years as a high school science teacher. Before seeking her administrative license, Melissa coached new science and mathematics teachers in the district, and she continues to bring a wealth of instructional expertise to her position. Although Melissa enjoys the assistant principal position, she aspires to be a principal one day.

Like many assistant principals, Melissa’s day is very busy as she moves between leading schoolwide initiatives, such as improving schoolwide security and the science curriculum. In addition to these schoolwide initiatives, Melissa is responsible for conducting all science, mathematics, and art teacher performance evaluations and for overseeing the 10th grade.

Melissa’s district uses a weighted differentiated approach for determining assistant principal practice quality. According to district procedure, Melissa and her principal meet at the beginning of the school year to discuss her job priorities and assign weights to the State Model Principal Evaluation standards. Melissa and her principal agreed that her work would continue to focus on instructional leadership during the school year, specifically Standards 2, 3, and 5. They also determined that Standards 1, 4, and 6 were not applicable to her current job responsibilities and, therefore, would not be measured. Together, they agreed to the weights in the chart below.

The principal and Melissa gathered performance evidence during the academic year. The district requires principals to observe assistant principals leading data conversations with teachers twice during the school year, teacher survey ratings of assistant principal practice, in addition to an assistant principal portfolio. Each piece of evidence is considered by the principal and another rater, and scores are assigned for each standard based on the preponderance of evidence. The principal writes the score for each standard in the “score of combined measures” column.

Standard	Score of Combined Measures		Weight		Score
1. Living a mission and vision focused on results	Not measured	X	0	=	
2. Leading and managing systems change	3.4	X	2	=	6.8
3. Improving teaching and learning	3.1	X	1	=	3.1
4. Building and maintaining collaborative relationships	Not measured	X	0	=	
5. Leading with integrity and professionalism	3.1	X	1	=	3.1
6. Creating and sustaining a culture of high expectations	Not measured	X	0	=	
Total					13.0
Average of all relevant standards	13/4			=	3.25
Summative score					Proficient

The principal reviews each standard score and creates an average score, which is helpful for Melissa to see. Scores are calculated with a simple average. A score assigned a “1” weight is counted once, and a score assigned a weight of “2” is counted twice, according to the district procedure. Accordingly, Melissa’s total score is 13, and the average score of 3.25 is determined by dividing the total by 4 scores

The principal and superintendent then meet to discuss the score and assign Melissa a rating, again based upon the preponderance of evidence. Melissa receives the scoring chart, a rationale and narrative explaining the scores, and copies of evidence collected during the year at her summative evaluation meeting.

Options for Student Growth Component of the Assistant Principal Evaluation

Illinois law and administrative rule require student growth measures be included in assistant principal evaluation. The law also provides districts discretion in determining which student growth measures are used (see Box 1). The Illinois State Model for Principal Evaluation describes the student growth component for assistant principals, and, in recognition that principal and assistant principal responsibilities may vary, the Illinois State Model for Principal Evaluation document states “Assistant principal evaluators will select student growth measures that are appropriate for the assistant principal assignment.” (p. 26).

Box 5. Definition of Student Growth

The Illinois State Board of Education PEAC State Model for Principal Evaluation (n.d., p.4) defines student growth as follows. As the text indicates, the definition applies to principals and assistant principals.

Definition of Student Growth—A measurable change in student outcomes at the school level.

- By statute, 50% of the State Model Principal Evaluation is comprised of data and indicators of student growth.
- The Proposed PERA Administrative Rules require that at least 25% of principal and assistant principal evaluations are comprised of student growth based on academic assessments in 2012–2013 and 2013–2014, and at least 30% of principal and assistant principal evaluations are comprised of student growth based on academic assessments in 2014–2015 and beyond: • “Academic” is defined as any instructional area for which Illinois state standards exist
- Require the use of multiple academic assessments
- The state model uses assessments that meet the definition of Type I and Type II for principal evaluation, including state assessments and Type III assessments may be used for schools serving a majority of students who are not administered a Type I or Type II assessment. In these situations, the qualified evaluator and principal may identify at least two Type III assessments to be used to determine student growth.
- For purposes of the State Model Principal Evaluation, the remaining 25% (and then 20%) of the student growth portion can focus on similar academic assessments of growth, or on a broader set of student outcome measures (see Appendix D.10 for sample list)

The State Model for Principal Evaluation requires school districts to use multiple assessments for the student growth evaluation for principals and assistant principals. Districts may use any assessments that meet the definition of Type I and Type II for principal and assistant principal evaluation. Type III assessments may be used for schools serving a majority of students who are not administered a Type I or Type II assessment. The State Model for Principal Evaluation also allows school districts to identify other student growth assessments applicable to assistant principals.

The guidance recommends assistant principal summative performance-level ratings be the same as those for principals. The rating scale, which is described in the State Model for Principal Evaluation is as follows:

- **Exceeds Goal**—Exceeds the target for a majority of the student growth measures; meets all targets

- **Meets Goal**—Meets or exceeds the target for a majority of the student growth measures; does not have negative growth on any measures
- **Minimal Growth**—Meets only 1 or 2 student growth targets; has no more than one measure with negative growth results
- **No Growth or Negative Growth**—Does not meet any student growth targets; demonstrates negative growth on one or more measures (Illinois State Board of Education Performance Evaluation Advisory Council State Model for Principal Evaluation, n.d., p. 5)

This guidance provides two options for the student growth component of assistant principal evaluation. Within both options, districts may choose to add other measures of student growth that are appropriate to the assistant principal position. According to statute, a district may elect to assign up to 20 percent of assistant principal evaluation to other student growth measures.

Options for the Student Academic Growth Component for Assistant Principal Evaluation

Student academic growth (Type I and Type II) may be included in assistant principal evaluation and, if included, may be worth between 50 percent and 30 percent of the entire assistant principal performance evaluation. Districts have at least two decisions when determining the student academic growth component for assistant principals:

1. Will the assistant principal and principal evaluation use the same, schoolwide student academic growth measure (Type I and Type II), or will the student academic growth measure for assistant principals be calculated based upon subgroup performance, which reflects the assistant principal’s specific work responsibilities?
2. Will the student academic growth component be assigned the same weight (i.e., proportion of the entire summative evaluation) as for the principal evaluation, or will the proportion that student growth contributes to the final summative score be different?

Regarding Question 1, districts may choose to use the same student academic growth measures (Type I and Type II assessments) for principals and assistant principals. Districts choosing to use schoolwide student academic growth (Type I and Type II assessments) may do so because they believe that doing so reinforces common student growth targets for principals and assistant principals.

Box 6. PERA Assessment Types

The following assessment types are identified by PERA.

Type I assessment: An assessment that measures a certain group of students in the same manner with the same potential assessment items; is scored by a non-district entity; and is widely administered beyond Illinois.

Type II assessment: An assessment developed or adopted and approved by the school district and used on a districtwide basis that is given by all teachers in a given grade or subject area.

Type III assessment: An assessment that is rigorous, aligned with the course’s curriculum, and that the evaluator and teacher determine measures student learning.

Performance Evaluation Reform Act (PERA; P.A. 96-861)

Some districts may choose to differentiate principal and assistant principal contributions to student academic growth because the districts may believe that assistant principals have less schoolwide influence on student academic growth. Districts have the option of several approaches to differentiate principal and assistant principal student academic growth. For example, a district could calculate student academic growth for the assistant principal evaluation by using test scores from only those students taught by teachers the assistant principal oversees. The district may opt to do this because an assistant principal may have substantial oversight responsibilities for curriculum, instructional, and classroom teaching in several content areas or a selected grade level, but the assistant principal may have little to no authority over other content areas or grade levels.

Regarding Question 2, districts also may choose to assign the same weight on the student academic growth component for principals and assistant principals or use a different weight. The Illinois Model for Principal Evaluation provides districts discretion to assign a weight of between 30 percent and 50 percent to the total performance evaluation to the student academic component for principals and assistant principals. Therefore, a district may opt to assign either the same or a different weight for the student academic growth percentage from the weight used for principals. Districts can modify the weighting of academic growth regardless of whether they have decided to use the same or differing measures for student growth than those measures used for principals (see Question 1, above). Research provides little guidance to districts on the influence of assistant principals on student academic performance with which to guide district decisions.

We note that districts also may consider adjusting the weight of the “other” student growth component for *each individual assistant principal*, but this guidance does not recommend pursuing this approach because it is not a districtwide approach. Should a district opt to use different metrics or weights for each assistant principal, we recommend the district consult legal counsel to determine a systematic approach metric and weight assignment.

Box 7. Examples of Other Student Growth Measures

The following examples of other student growth measures may be considered by school districts, according to the State Model for Principal Evaluation (Illinois State Board of Education, n.d., p. 26):

Academic measures:

- Attainment measures on academic assessments
- Cohort-to-cohort improvement measures on academic assessments
- Sub-group performance data on academic assessments
- Pass rates on AP exams; and potentially by sub-group as well
- 21st century skill assessments (may be non-test depending on assessment)
- Growth for ell students
- Workkeys assessments

Non-test measures:

- Attendance
- Postsecondary matriculation and persistence
- Graduation rate
- % on track to graduation
- 9th grade and 10th grade promotion
- Tracy
- Excused/unexcused absences
- Discipline information (referrals)- if district has consistent definitions and approach (ex. PBIS, student behavior programs)
- AP completion rates
- Dual-credit earning rates

Options for the Other Student Growth Component for Assistant Principal Evaluation

The Illinois State Model for Principal Evaluation provides district discretion in the use of other student growth measures in principal and assistant principal evaluation. Other growth measures may include, for example, one or more of the following: student learning objectives attainment, student attendance rates, student high school graduation rate, student dropout rate, student progression to next grade level rate. If a school district determines that Type I and Type II measures will not be used for assistant principal evaluation, then the district must identify other student growth measures for assistant principal evaluation. If school districts determine to use Type I and Type II measures, the district may choose to also include other student growth measures in the assistant principal evaluation. The other student growth category may constitute up to 20 percent of the assistant principal summative evaluation.

Districts have at least two decisions to make when determining the student other growth component for assistant principals:

1. Will the other student growth component be a schoolwide measure, which is the same as the “other” measure used for the principal, or will the other student growth component be differentiated to reflect the assistant principal responsibility for specific subgroups of students within the school?
2. Will the other student growth component be assigned the same weight (i.e., proportion of the entire summative evaluation) as for principal evaluation, or will the proportion that “other” student growth contributes to the final score be different?

Regarding Question 1, the district may or may not opt to use another student growth category in assistant principal evaluation. Districts choosing to include one or more measures in the other student growth category may choose the same measures used for principal evaluation or may opt to use one or more different measures for assistant principal evaluation. Districts applying the same measure(s) for principals and assistant principals may have the rationale that doing so reinforces common student growth targets for principals and assistant principals.

Some districts may choose one or more different other student growth measures for assistant principals and principals. Certain district initiatives, for example, may engage all assistant principals in certain tasks associated with other student growth outcomes. When districts choose other student growth outcomes, it is important that assistant principals have substantial responsibility for completing tasks logically associated with the other student growth measure. For example, a high assistant principal may have substantial responsibility for schoolwide student matriculation or student academic interventions, which may be logically associated with student graduation rates.

Regarding Question 2, the district may opt to use the same weight for principals and assistant principals in the other student growth category or may opt to differentiate. Districts applying the same weight for other student growth to principals and assistant principals may have the rationale that the approach reinforces common learning targets for both types of administrators. Using a different weight provides an additional option for differentiation, which would assign between 1 percent and 20 percent of an assistant principal’s total summative evaluation to the

other student growth category. We note, again, that districts may consider adjusting the weight of the other student growth component for each assistant principal, but this guidance does not recommend pursuing this approach because it is not a districtwide approach. Should a district decide to adjust weighting of the other student growth measures for each individual assistant principal, we recommend the district consult legal counsel to determine a systematic approach for weight assignment.

References

- Barnett, B., Shoho, A., & Oleszewski, A. (2012). The job responsibilities of beginning and experienced assistant principals. *Leadership and Policy in Schools, 11*(1) 92–128.
- The Council of Chief State School Officers. (2008). *Educational leadership policy standards: ISSLLC 2008*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from http://www.ccsso.org/Documents/2008/Educational_Leadership_Policy_Standards_2008.pdf
- Greenfield, W. (1984). *Sociological perspectives for research on educational administrators: The role of the assistant principal*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, April 23–27).
- Hausman, C., Nebeker, A., McCreary, J., & Donaldson, G. (2002). The worklife of the assistant principal. *Journal of Educational Administration, 40*(2), 136–157.
- Illinois State Board of Education. (n.d.). *Performance evaluation advisory council: State model for principal evaluation*. Springfield, IL: Author. Retrieved from https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=4&cad=rja&uact=8&ved=0ahUKEwj3y4PAyL7KAhXowHIKHcVeCmYQFgg1MAM&url=http%3A%2F%2Fillinoischoolleader.org%2Fadvisorycouncil%2Fdocuments%2Fpeac_prin_eval_model.docx&usq=AFQjCNHy1dkPNcnYcUtmwjF7Hz2JpvqUVg
- Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation. (2008). *The personnel evaluation standards: How to assess systems of evaluating educators*. New York, NY: Corwin Press.
- Mertz, N. (2000). *Contextualizing the position of assistant principal*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the University Council of Education Administration, Albuquerque, November 3–5.
- National Policy Board for Education Administration. (2015). *Professional Standards for Educational Leaders*. Reston, VA: Author.
- Turnbull, B., Riley, D., & MacFarlane, J. (2013). Building a strong principalship, volume 2: Cultivating talent through a principal pipeline. New York, NY: The Wallace Foundation.